Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. Tolson

DATE: Dec. 28, 1955

FROM : L. B. Nichols

SUBJECT: [redacted]

On December 23, 1955, in the afternoon, [redacted] Attorney General Warren Olney came by my office again and stated that they had re-interviewed [redacted] He produced [redacted] what appeared to be a log showing work which [redacted] done investigating the [redacted] that this investigation was undertaken for a [redacted] insisted that he had known [redacted] for some twenty years, had worked wi[redacted] previously; that he had done work with him in New York, tha[redacted] used a wire recorder for the job at the Willard Hotel. [redacted] on the other hand, states that he used a Presto recorder; that he never knew [redacted] until he was called b[redacted] to work on this specific case; tha[redacted] so-called log reflects investigative efforts for approximately two years and was the type of thing that could not be prepared overnight; that the log purported to show what [redacted] was doing. [redacted] further told Murphy of Olney's staff that [redacted] and [redacted] were very close friends and that he understands that [redacted] was the "bagman" for [redacted] Olney stated that [redacted] tells some kind of a story about a former Congressman or Senator who was involved in some manner in giving advice to [redacted] further states that the recordin[redacted] made by [redacted] did not amount to anything and that, in fact, was not information enough to even make a typed transcript. Olney stated that the situation is now very rapidly getting to the point where our source is the key to the situation and that they might want to be put in touch with the source in view of the conflicting statements between [redacted] and [redacted] on the one hand and [redacted] and the source on the other.

It is being pointed out that [redacted] claims to Olney that he did the [redacted] recording job at the solicitation of [redacted] and out of the White House, whereas on one occasion, [redacted] Another time [redacted]

cc: Mr. Boardman
Mr. Rosen
LBN[redacted]4)

RECORDED-27

INDEXED-27

62-102774-5

17 JAN 12 1956

SENT DIRECTOR

60 JAN 17 1956

b7C

Memorandum to Mr. Tolson from L. B. Nichols
RE: [redacted]

b7C

The foregoing, of course, has been given to Olney in conversations earlier in the week. Now that Olney raised the basic question about talking to the source and how certain can we be that the source is telling the truth, Olney was told that we, of course, could not divulge the identity of the source and would not under any circumstances, without the source's permission; that the source had been reliable in the past, it would be inconceivable that the source would be making a statement unless their was a basis for it.

Olney inquired if we could recheck with the source. I told him that we, of course, could do this but that it was felt that the source would furnish the same information he had previously furnished. Olney then stated that he felt duty-bound to mention another matter which he wanted to preface by stating that he did so most reluctantly because he did not want any erroneous interpretation placed upon it. He then pointed out that on the preceding day, when he came in to see me, [redacted] was sitting in my outer office; that he knew [redacted] and they merely passed the time of day. On December 23 1955, however, Wyllys S. Newcomb, his ~~Special~~ Assistant handling the case in St. Louis direct, received a call from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat inquiring whether Newcomb of the Department was looking for the recordings in the [redacted] case. Olney stated that he knew the Bureau too well and knew that the Bureau would not have passed out any information, but he was wondering if by any chance [redacted] could have gotten the information from the source. I told him I could not answer as to this; that I knew that [redacted] had been to the Bureau; that I knew the nature of his inquiry; that I knew without even checking that no information would be furnished him.

b7C

b7C

Olney is steeped in suspicion.

I subsequently checked with Mr. DeLoach who informed me that he made no reference whatsoever to the [redacted] matter at the time [redacted] called on him. [redacted]

b7C

Since this has been the subject of previous press releases, I told Mr. DeLoach to go ahead and furnish him with the information we had previously given out.

Subsequently, Mr. DeLoach told me that he had learned from [redacted] that [redacted] I, accordingly, told Mr. DeLoach on Friday to endeavor to contact [redacted] over the weekend and to gooer the information previously furnished by [redacted] which Mr. DeLoach did do. I also told him to point out that

b7C
b7D

Memorandum to Mr. Tolson from L. B. Nichols
RE: [redacted]

b7C

Mr. Olney had taken up with us the matter of identifying our source of information which we had declined to do and to mention the St. Louis Globe-Democrat inquiry on whether the Department was looking for recordings in the [redacted] case, to mention the meeting o[redacted]nd Olney in my office, and to point out to [redacted]

b7C
b7D

Mr. DeLoach had an occasion to see [redacted] on December 24, 1955, and the foregoing matters were raised. Mr. DeLoach tells m[redacted] advised him as follows:

[redacted]

Memorandum to Mr. Tolson from L. B. Nichols
RE: [redacted]

b7C

[redacted]

b7C
b7D

Should Olney recontact me, I will tell Olney tha[redacted]

[redacted] is, of course, obvious that Olney if he pressed the matter with [redacted]n an effort to find out the names of all person to whom [redacted] had made the

b7C
b7D

Memorandum to Mr. Tolson from L. B. Nichols
RE: [redacted]

b7C

statements, could identify [redacted] In fact, in one of the earlier conversation, Olney stated that [redacted] had told him that [redacted] I told Olney at the time that I knew of [redacted] Olney then stated that [redacted] was somewhat indefinite about this and referred to the fact that the individual rides towork with an FBI Agent and his name was something like Nellis or some such name. [redacted]

b7C
b7D

ADDENDUM, LBN [redacted] 12-28-55

[redacted]

b7C
b7D

ADDENDUM, LBN [redacted] 12-28-55

Late on the afternoon of 12-28-55, Olney came to my office and inquired if we had heard anything further from the source. I told him we had talked to the source over the week end and the source had reaffirmed the statements previously reported as having been made by [redacted] and which had been reported to the Department. I further told Olney that the source had reminded us that he had given us the information in confidence and for which reason it would be impossible to divulge the identity of the source. Olney stated that he has now concluded that the [redacted] story was a diversion and that the incident which [redacted] related actually did take place but that this was a tactic being employed by [redacted]

b7C

Memorandum to Mr. Tolson from L. B. Nichols
RE: [redacted]

b7C

to avoid telling of the incident which we reported. He stated that he has now concluded that he would take [redacted] before the Grand Jury and that he has now concluded [redacted] is telling him the truth and is not involved in the [redacted] recordings.

Olney further stated that he is satisfied himself that [redacted] did not hold out on Rogers since [redacted] was the individual who told Rogers that [redacted] had told him [redacted] that he had been caught with the recordings, that he was desperate and needed money. Olney states that he is also planning to take [redacted] before the Grand Jury and question him about [redacted] conversation with [redacted] and after this then call [redacted] before the Grand Jury. Olney states that it would be very helpful to him if he could be put in touch with the source directly so that he could reconstruct the source's information as best he could so that he could be in a position to question [redacted] before the Grand Jury.

b7C

I told Olney that this we could not do. Olney then inquired if there was some particular reason why the source wanted to have his identity concealed. I told him quite frankly the source was in a delicate position, that he was a chap who had been around town many years, and had been helpful in the past, and that under these circumstances we certainly could not violate a confidence. Olney stated that he did not want us to violate any confidence, that he deeply appreciated the promptness in which we had reported the situation to the Department, and that he could very well appreciate our position which he would respect.

The question did arise as to what might happen should [redacted] give a statement as to the individuals he had related the information to, that it was entirely possible the source might be identified in this manner. I told Olney that was a bridge to cross when we came to it, that certainly if this occurred, it would not be us who would be violating a confidence. He stated he agreed.

b7C

[redacted] is making it difficult for us in maintaining his confidence by his talking to other persons regarding matter. K